

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Final Office Action of August 3, 2006, in view of the Notice of Panel Decision from Pre-Appeal Brief Review mailed December 22, 2006, has been carefully reviewed and these remarks are responsive thereto. Claims 19, 26-29, 35, 36, and 38 have been amended. Claims 41-46 have been added. No new matter has been added. Claims 19-39 and 41-46 remain pending in the application. Reconsideration and allowance of the instant application are respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

Interview Summary

Applicant once again wishes to thank the Examiner for taking the time on November 6, 2006 to conduct a personal interview with Applicant's undersigned representative. A summary of the interview was included previously in the Pre-Appeal Brief Request For Review dated December 4, 2006.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Claims 19-23 and 26-39 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Parulski. This rejection is respectfully traversed for the following reasons.

Amended independent claim 19 relates to, *inter alia*, a single composite image quality indicator comprising a plurality of portions, each portion displayable in a first state and a second state, wherein a number of portions displayed in the second state corresponds to a number of stable image quality parameters and wherein the plurality of portions are displayed simultaneously. Nowhere does Parulski teach or suggest such features. At best, Parulski teaches displaying warning messages indicating exposure or motion problems. Col. 29, ll. 15-48; see also FIGS. 34-37. Even assuming, without admitting, that the warning messages constitute a plurality of portions of a composite image quality indicator, Parulski still lacks any teaching or suggest that the number of warnings displayed in a second state corresponds to a number of stable image quality parameters, as recited in claim 19. Instead, Parulski describes a set of revision suggestions (e.g., FIG. 38). Even if, without admitting, the set of revision suggestions constitutes a single composite image quality indicator, Parulski fails to teach or suggest

displaying a plurality of portions of the set of revision suggestions simultaneously, as is also recited in claim 19. Claim 19 is thus allowable for at least these reasons.

Amended independent claim 26 recites a method for, *inter alia*, displaying a composite image quality indicator having a plurality of portions, each portion displayable in a first state and a second state, wherein a number of portions displayed in the second state corresponds to a number of stable image quality parameters and wherein the plurality of portions are displayed simultaneously. As discussed with respect to claim 19, Parulski merely describes displaying a series of revision suggestions consecutively. Nowhere does Parulski teach or suggest that a number of portions of an image quality indicator displayed in a second state corresponds to a number of stable image quality parameters or that the plurality of portions are displayed simultaneously. Claim 26 is thus allowable for at least these reasons.

Amended independent claim 36 relates to method comprising, *inter alia*, displaying a composite image quality indicator having a plurality of segmented portions, each portion displayable in a first state and a second state, wherein a number of segmented portions displayed in the second state corresponds to a number of stable image quality parameters. As discussed above with respect to claim 26, Parulski lacks any teaching or suggest of such features. Accordingly, claim 36 is also allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 26.

Dependent claims 20-23, 27-35, and 37-39 each depend from at least one of independent claims 19, 26, and 36. The dependent claims, by virtue of depending from allowable base claims, are allowable for at least the same reasons as their respective base claims, and further in view of the non-obvious and novel features recited therein.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 24 and 25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Parulski. This rejection is respectfully traversed for the following reasons.

Claims 24 and 25 are dependent on claim 19 and thus, incorporate the features of claim 19. As discussed previously, Parulski fails to teach or suggest each and every feature of claim 19. The Office's Official Notice does not cure the above identified deficiencies of Parulski. Accordingly, claims 24 and 25 are allowable for at least these reasons.

New Claims

Claims 41-46 have been added. Claims 41 and 44 generally relate to, *inter alia*, a composite image quality indicator comprising a plurality of portions, each portion displayable in a first state and a second state, wherein a number of portions displayed in the second state corresponds to a number of stable image quality parameters and wherein the plurality of portions are displayed simultaneously. As discussed previously with respect to claim 19, Parulski lacks any teaching or suggestion of such features. Accordingly, claims 41 and 44 are allowable for at least reasons similar to those discussed with respect to claim 19.

Claims 42, 43, 45 and 46 are dependent on claims 41 and 44, respectively, and are thus allowable for at least the same reasons as their base independent claims and further in view of the novel and non-obvious features recited therein.

CONCLUSION

All rejections having been addressed, Applicant respectfully submits that the instant application is in condition for allowance, and respectfully solicits prompt notification of the same. However, if for any reason the Examiner believes the application is not in condition for allowance or there are any questions, the examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at (202) 824-3156.

Respectfully submitted,
BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.

Dated this 5th day of February, 2007

By: /Chunhsi Andy Mu/
Chunhsi Andy Mu, Registration No. 58,216

1001 G Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20001-4597
Tel: (202) 824-3000
Fax: (202) 824-3001